

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, there is legislation contained in this bill before us that is protected by the rule, legislating on an appropriations bill. This legislation that pertains to the Bonneville Power Administration is very, very problematic, and in fact, is contradicted by language in the manager's report. But, of course, we know the language in the manager's report does not hold sway over legislative provisions contained within the bill protected by the rule, riders on the bill.

There are two provisions that are aimed at Bonneville Power Administration and other Federal power marketing agencies that are damaging and very ill-informed. One is incredibly broad, and it would repeal legislation Congress passed by a large majority in the 1992 Energy Policy Act.

□ 1615

It allowed the Bonneville Power Administration to directly fund operations and maintenance at hydroelectric facilities operated by the Army Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation in the Pacific Northwest.

For years, we had a horrendous backlog and horrendous inefficiency. But then this amendment passed. In fact, now unlike other Federal power marketing agencies and systems around the country, we are pretty much up to date, and it is working very efficiently and effectively, both for the Federal taxpayers and for the region.

Why would this bill repeal that? It is some sort of strange flat-earth view of competition that does not exist and cannot effectively deal with the problem and did not before we had a change in the statute.

Secondly, the bill would prevent Bonneville Power Administration and other PMAs from cooperating with the utility customers to properly maintain the regional transmission grades.

Here we are worried about system reliability across the country which carries both public and private power, and we are going to undermine that in this bill. That is not a good move for the West or even the Southeast in terms of the Tennessee Valley Authority and other PMAs. It is very damaging. In fact, it is so damaging that I will have to vote against the entire bill, and I would urge other western Members to do the same.

Finally, there is a provision that forces BPA to discontinue an important infrastructure development. BPA is installing a fiberoptic network on its transmission towers to improve its communication and its dispatch of power. It is good business. They need to do it.

At virtually no incremental cost, they could provide excess capacity to remote rural communities who will

never see in this century or even in the next century for 20 or 30 years a private provider stringing fiberoptics to their communities.

BPA owns 80 percent of the transmission. It does not, by policy, allow other people to access or hang things on its transmission. They are the only alternative out there. In some, again, misguided attempt to bring about competition that does not exist, and if it did exist, I would not be up here on that particular issue and prohibit them from using their excess capacity at no incremental cost to provide services to those communities.

These are ill-intentioned. They are not overcome by the manager's language. I urge colleagues to vote against the entire bill unless these are fixed.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this open rule. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2587, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 260, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 201, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

YEAS—227

Aderholt	Castle	Franks (NJ)
Archer	Chabot	Frelinghuysen
Armey	Chambliss	Gallegly
Bachus	Coble	Ganske
Baker	Coburn	Gekas
Ballenger	Collins	Gibbons
Barr	Combest	Gilchrest
Barrett (NE)	Cook	Gillmor
Bartlett	Cooksey	Gilman
Barton	Cox	Goode
Bass	Crane	Goodlatte
Bateman	Cubin	Goodling
Bereuter	Cunningham	Goss
Biggert	Davis (VA)	Graham
Bilbray	Deal	Granger
Bilirakis	DeLay	Green (TX)
Bliley	DeMint	Green (WI)
Blunt	Diaz-Balart	Greenwood
Boehlert	Dickey	Gutknecht
Boehner	Doolittle	Hall (OH)
Bonilla	Dreier	Hansen
Bono	Duncan	Hastings (WA)
Brady (TX)	Dunn	Hayes
Burr	Ehlers	Hayworth
Burton	Ehrlich	Hefley
Buyer	Emerson	Herger
Callahan	English	Hill (MT)
Calvert	Everett	Hilleary
Camp	Ewing	Hobson
Campbell	Fletcher	Hoekstra
Canady	Foley	Hooey
Cannon	Fossella	Horn
	Fowler	Hostettler

Houghton	Morella	Sherwood
Hulshof	Myrick	Shimkus
Hunter	Nethercutt	Shuster
Hutchinson	Ney	Simpson
Hyde	Northup	Skeen
Isakson	Norwood	Smith (MI)
Istook	Nussle	Smith (NJ)
Jenkins	Ose	Smith (TX)
Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Souder
Johnson, Sam	Packard	Spence
Jones (NC)	Paul	Stearns
Kasich	Pease	Stump
Kelly	Petri	Sununu
King (NY)	Pickering	Sweeney
Kingston	Pitts	Talent
Knollenberg	Pombo	Tancred
Kolbe	Porter	Tauzin
Kuykendall	Portman	Taylor (MS)
LaHood	Pryce (OH)	Taylor (NC)
Largent	Quinn	Terry
Latham	Radanovich	Thomas
LaTourette	Ramstad	Thornberry
Lazio	Regula	Thune
Leach	Reynolds	Tiahrt
Lewis (CA)	Riley	Toomey
Lewis (KY)	Rogan	Trafigant
Linder	Rogers	Upton
LoBiondo	Rohrabacher	Vitter
Lucas (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden
Lucas (OK)	Roukema	Walsh
Manzullo	Royce	Wamp
McCollum	Ryan (WI)	Watkins
McCrery	Ryun (KS)	Watts (OK)
McHugh	Salmon	Weldon (FL)
McInnis	Sanford	Weldon (PA)
McIntosh	Saxton	Weller
McIntyre	Scarborough	Whitfield
McKeon	Schaffer	Wicker
Metcalf	Sensenbrenner	Wilson
Mica	Sessions	Wolf
Miller (FL)	Shadegg	Young (AK)
Miller, Gary	Shaw	Young (FL)
Moran (KS)	Shays	

NAYS—201

Abercrombie	Engel	Maloney (CT)
Ackerman	Eshoo	Maloney (NY)
Allen	Etheridge	Markey
Andrews	Evans	Martinez
Baird	Farr	Mascara
Baldacci	Fattah	Matsui
Baldwin	Filner	McCarthy (MO)
Barcia	Forbes	McCarthy (NY)
Barrett (WI)	Ford	McGovern
Becerra	Frank (MA)	McKinney
Bentsen	Frost	McNulty
Berkley	Gedden	Meehan
Berman	Gephardt	Meek (FL)
Berry	Gonzalez	Meeks (NY)
Bishop	Gordon	Menendez
Blagojevich	Gutierrez	Millender
Blumenauer	Hall (TX)	McDonald
Bonior	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Borski	Hill (IN)	Minge
Boswell	Hilliard	Mink
Boucher	Hinchey	Moakley
Boyd	Hinojosa	Mollohan
Brady (PA)	Hoeffel	Moore
Brown (FL)	Holden	Moran (VA)
Brown (OH)	Holt	Murtha
Capps	Hoyer	Nadler
Capuano	Inslee	Napolitano
Cardin	Jackson (IL)	Neal
Carson	Jackson-Lee	Obey
Clay	(TX)	Olver
Clayton	Jefferson	Ortiz
Clement	John	Owens
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Condit	Jones (OH)	Pascrell
Conyers	Kanjorski	Pastor
Costello	Kaptur	Payne
Coyne	Kennedy	Pelosi
Cramer	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
Crowley	Kilpatrick	Phelps
Danner	Kind (WI)	Pickett
Davis (FL)	Kleczka	Pomeroy
Davis (IL)	Klink	Price (NC)
DeFazio	Kucinich	Rahall
DeGette	LaFalce	Rangel
Delahunt	Lampson	Reyes
DeLauro	Lantos	Rivers
Deutsch	Larson	Rodriguez
Dicks	Lee	Roemer
Dingell	Levin	Rothman
Dixon	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Doggett	Lipinski	Rush
Dooley	Lofgren	Sabo
Doyle	Lowey	Sanchez
Edwards	Luther	Sanders

Sandlin	Stark	Velazquez
Sawyer	Stenholm	Vento
Schakowsky	Strickland	Visclosky
Scott	Stupak	Waters
Serrano	Tanner	Watt (NC)
Sherman	Tauscher	Waxman
Shows	Thompson (CA)	Weiner
Sisisky	Thompson (MS)	Wexler
Skelton	Thurman	Weygand
Slaughter	Tierney	Wise
Smith (WA)	Towns	Woolsey
Snyder	Turner	Wu
Spratt	Udall (CO)	Wynn
Stabenow	Udall (NM)	

NOT VOTING—5

Chenoweth	McDermott	Peterson (PA)
Cummings	Oberstar	

□ 1640

Mr. CRAMER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GOODLATTE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2605) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

## ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 261 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2605.

□ 1642

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2605) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. Hansen in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD).

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. PACKARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to present to the Committee of the Whole for its consideration the bill H.R. 2605, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides annual funding for a wide array of Federal Government programs involving such diverse matters as national security, environmental cleanup, flood control, advanced scientific research, navigation, alternative energy sources, and the nuclear power regulation.

□ 1645

Programs funded by this bill affect multiple aspects of American life, having significant implications for domestic security, commercial competitiveness, and the advance of science.

I am proud of the bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations without amendment, and I believe it merits the support of the entire membership of this body.

Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of this bill is its constrained size. The measure represents an unqualified victory for fiscal austerity, conservatism, and responsibility.

Total funding for the energy and water bill in H.R. 2605 is \$20.19 billion. This is more than \$900 million below the fiscal year 1999 baseline for energy and water development programs. Further, it is \$1.4 billion below the budget request and more than \$1 billion less than the energy and water bill passed by the Senate earlier this year.

Mr. Chairman, the substantial cuts contained in H.R. 2605 are real. They are not produced by smoke and mirrors gimmicks or creative accounting. They, rather, are the result of a fiscal discipline demanding reduction in the size, scope, and cost of the Federal Government.

Despite the bill's deep programmatic reductions, it provides adequate funding for the continuation of high priority programs, promising the greatest return on the investment of taxpayer dollars.

The cost-effective civil works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, for example, is funded at a level significantly higher than the budget request and slightly higher than the fiscal year 1999 level. This funding is more than offset by considerable reductions in the Department of Energy.

The bill requires, for example, a reduction of \$125 million in DOE contractor travel expenses. This is one-half the level of this current year. And, as my colleagues all know, we have received documented evidence of abusive travel in that Department.

Mr. Chairman, I owe a great debt of gratitude to the hard-working members of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development. They have labored hard under difficult fiscal con-

straints to provide a bill that is balanced and fair.

I especially want to express my gratitude to the ranking minority member, the honorable gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY). He has been extremely helpful. Together we have developed a good bill. I know there are one or two items of disagreement, but overall I think both of us support a very good bill.

I am very proud of his efforts and pleased that we have worked as well as we have together. It is in large part due to his effort that we present this bill that merits the support of all the Members on final passage.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to support H.R. 2605 as reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to present to the Committee of the Whole for its consideration H.R. 2605, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides annual funding for a wide array of Federal government programs, comprehending such diverse matters as national security, environmental cleanup, flood control, advanced scientific research, navigation, alternative energy sources, and nuclear power regulation. Programs funded by this bill affect multiple aspects of American life, having significant implications for domestic security, commercial competitiveness, and the advance of science. I am proud of the bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations without amendment, and I believe it merits the support of the entire membership of this body.

Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of this bill is its constrained size. The measure represents an unqualified victory for fiscal austerity, conservatism and responsibility. Total funding for energy and water programs in H.R. 2605 is \$20.19 billion. This is more than \$900 million below the fiscal year 1999 baseline for energy and water development programs. Furthermore, it is \$1.4 billion below the budget request and more than \$1 billion less than the Energy and Water Bill passed by the Senate earlier this summer.

Mr. Chairman, the substantial cuts contained in H.R. 2605 are real. They are not produced by smoke and mirrors, gimmicks, or creative accounting. Rather, they are the result of a fiscal discipline demanding reduction in the size, scope and cost of the Federal government.

Despite the bill's deep programmatic reductions, it provides adequate funding for the continuation of high-priority programs promising the greatest return on the investment of taxpayers dollars. The cost-effective civil works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, for example, is funded at a level significantly higher than the budget request and slightly higher than fiscal year 1999. This funding is more than offset by considerable reductions in the Department of Energy. The bill requires, for example, a reduction of \$125 million in DOE contractor travel expenses, an area of documented abuse.

Title I of the bill provides funding for the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers. The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development is unanimous in its belief that this program is among the most valuable within the Subcommittee's jurisdiction. The national benefits of projects for flood control, navigation